

STATUS OF THE SUPERINTENDENT'S PROFESSIONAL
" TRAINING, EXPERIENCE, TENURE,
AND PROFESSIONAL FREEDOM

by

in Ed
Barney K. Baker
B. S., Kansas State Teachers College,
Pittsburg, Kansas. 1921

Submitted to the School of
Education and the Faculty of
the Graduate School of the
University of Kansas in partial
fulfillment of the requirement
for the degree of Master of Arts.

Approved by:

J. W. P. [Signature]
Instructor in Charge
Raymond A. Schurz [Signature]
Head of Department

May 19, 1926.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TITLE PAGE	1
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	2
LIST OF TABLES.....	4
LETTER OF ACKNOWLEDGMENT.....	7
I. INTRODUCTION.....	8
A. Statement of General Problem.....	8
B. Validation of Problem.....	8
II. LITERATURE AND INVESTIGATION RELATED TO THE FIELD OF THE STUDY.....	14
A. History of the Superintendency.....	14
B. Legal Status of the Superintendent.....	18
C. Analyses of Board Rules.....	25
D. Miscellaneous Studies and Investigations.....	25
III. SPECIFIC FIELD OF STUDY.....	27
A. Definition of Field of Study.....	27
B. Limitation of Field of Study.....	27
C. Definition of Terms.....	28
D. Selection and Classification of Cities.....	29
IV. COLLECTION OF DATA.....	30
A. Sources of Data.....	30
B. Distribution of Questionnaires.....	30
C. Assemblage of Questionnaires.....	31
V. PRESENTATION OF DATA ON TRAINING, EXPERIENCE, TENURE, AND SIZE OF CITY.....	33
A. Training of Superintendents.....	33
B. Experience of Superintendent.....	45
C. Tenure.....	51
D. Size of City.....	53
E. Summary.....	56
VI. PRESENTATION OF DATA ON THE DISTRIBUTION OF FUNCTIONS IN ADMINISTRATION.....	58
A. Buildings.....	60
B. Teachers.....	64
C. Budget.....	68
D. Purchase of Supplies and Equipment.....	68
E. Janitors.....	68
F. Curriculum.....	69
G. Holidays.....	69
H. School Athletics.....	70
I. New Policies.....	70
J. Attitude of Board toward Miscellaneous Matters.....	70
K. Summary.....	74

	Page
VII. CORRELATION OF RESULTS.....	77
A. Training and Authority.....	78
B. Total Experience and Authority.....	79
C. Tenure and Authority.....	80
D. Size of City and Authority.....	81
E. Size of City and Training.....	82
F. Summary.....	83
VIII. CONCLUSIONS.....	84
APPENDIX.....	87
A. Bibliography.....	88
B. Questionnaire.....	91
C. List of Cities.....	93

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Division of Cities into Groups.....	29
II. Distribution and Assemblage of Questionnaires.....	31
III. State and City-Group Distribution and Assemblage of Questionnaires.....	32
IV. Professional Courses Arranged in the Order of Frequency.....	33
V. Additional Courses Named by Superintendents.....	36
VI. Training and Total Experience Distribution of 200 superintendents in the Four States.....	39
VII. Training and Total Experience Distribution of 70 Superintendents in Kansas.....	42
VIII. Training and Total Experience Distribution of 66 Superintendents in Missouri.....	43
IX. Training and Total Experience Distribution of 34 Superintendents in Nebraska.....	44
X. Training and Total Experience Distribution of 30 Superintendents in Oklahoma.....	45
XI. Frequency Distribution of Total Experience.....	46
XII. Percentage of Superintendents in Each Experience Group.....	47
XIII. Types of Administrative Experience.....	49
XIV. Tenure of Present Position.....	51

LIST OF TABLES, (Continued.)

Table		Page
XV.	Size of City-Training Distribution of 70 Superintendents in Kansas.....	53
XVI.	Size of City-Training Distribution of 66 Superintendents in Missouri.....	54
XVII.	Size of City-Training Distribution of 34 Superintendents in Nebraska.....	55
XVIII.	Size of City-Training Distribution of 30 Superintendents in Oklahoma.....	56
XIX.	Distribution of Functions of Superin- tendents and School Boards in the Four States.....	58
XX.	Comparison of the Authority of the Superintendent in the Four States.....	61
XXI.	Comparison of the Authority of the Board of Education in the Four States.....	63
XXII.	Comparison of the Authority of Both the Superintendent and the School Board in the Four States.....	65
XXIII.	Tabulation of Answers to Questions 9, 14, 19, 34, 35, 36.....	71
XXIV.	Correlation between Training and Authority of the Superintendent in the Four States.....	78
XXV.	Correlation between Authority and Total Experience in the Four States.....	79
XXVI.	Correlation between Tenure and Authority of Superintendents in the Four States.....	80

LIST OF TABLES, (Continued.)

Table	Page
XXVII. Correlation between Size of City and Authority of Superintendents in the Four States.....	81
XXVIII. Correlation between Training of Superintendents and the Size of City in Which They Are Employed.....	82

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author takes this occasion to express his appreciation to Dr. John W. Twente for his sympathetic guidance and suggestive criticism in the preparation of this study.

He is truly grateful to Dean R.A. Schwegler and Dr. H. P. Smith for their assistance in the early stages of the investigation and in the making of the questionnaire.

Likewise, he is indebted to the superintendents who have courteously and willingly responded to the request for the information which made this study possible.

Appreciation is expressed to the author's wife, Joy C. Baker, for encouragement so often given and for her untiring efforts in assisting in compiling the data of this study.

Chapter I.

INTRODUCTION

The problem of this study separates itself into four divisions, which are set forth in order below. Stated succinctly, the investigation undertakes to reveal the correlation between the:

- (a) amount of training of superintendents and the amount of authority in administration such superintendents possess;
- (b) total experience of superintendents and the amount of authority in administration they possess;
- (c) number of years superintendents have held their present positions and the extent of their administrative freedom;
- (d) size of cities and the degree of professional freedom in administration of superintendents in such cities.

With the growth and legal recognition of the office of superintendent of schools have come definitions, based on an assignment of functions, of the official relations which should exist between boards of education and school superintendents. Though the phrasing which sets forth the distinctions of authority in administration is varied, the relationships which leading administrators in the field of education declare to be vital are

essentially in agreement.

Cubberley, in discussing school organization, re-
 1
 marks:

A thoroughly fundamental principle in all proper school organization and administration is that there should be a real unity in the organization and a responsibility to one head in the administration, and that head of the school system should be no other than the superintendent of schools.

Linn in his resume of the opinions of a number of
 2
 school men says:

Some of the leading writers on educational administration including Ayres (Leonard P.), Bobbitt, Cubberley, Deffenbaugh and Theisen, are strongly urging that the school system should be regarded as a large productive business concern in charge of a board of directors who, acting for the stockholders, the people of the community, should engage the very best president or general manager, the superintendent, to act for it as executive and chief adviser and be responsible for the largest educational results possible.

Strayer gives in more detail his theory of the relationship which should prevail between school super-
 3
 intendants and school boards:

One important measure of school efficiency and capacity of a Superintendent of Schools is his willingness and his ability to assume authority and to carry large responsibilities, and, conversely, one important measure of intelligence

-
1. Cubberley, E. P., Report of the Survey of the Public School System of Salt Lake City, Utah, Chap. II. p. 30.
 2. Linn, L. P., City School Superintendent in General Legislation: Sch. & Soc., Vol. 8, Nov. 20, 1913, pp. 554-660.
 3. Strayer, G. D., Some Problems in City School Administration, p. 18.

and educational insight of a Board of School Trustees for a city school system is the degree to which they refer educational matters to the superintendent and intrust him to act for them, and then stand firmly behind him when he acts. . . . In all matters such as the hygienic aspects of schoolhouse construction, the outlining of courses of study, the selection of texts and supplemental books, passing on the competency of instruction or the efficiency of the service in the school departments. . . . action should be based only on the recommendation of the expert educational officer of the Board.

The preceding Quotations serve to show that men prominent in the field of educational administration have set up goals, or ideals, of professional freedom which superintendents, in order to fulfill their function in the school system, must reach.

The testimony of an educator in a position to know the actual practices in administration presents concisely the situation regarding the superintendency. Superintendent Beveridge of Omaha, Nebraska, in an address on the hazards of the superintendency, before the Department of Superintendence, in 1924, quoted from Judd as follows:

The plain fact is that the superintendency of any great school system is coming to be an almost impossible job. The superintendent is hampered in most cases by board action which constantly interferes with his expert professional efforts.

The situation which existed at Salt Lake City,²
³Portland, and other of the large cities up to the time

-
1. Beveridge, J. H., Hazards of the Superintendency and the Next Forward Steps in Reducing Them: Proceedings of the N. E. A., Vol. 62, 1924, pp. 864-869.
 2. Salt Lake Survey.
 3. Portland Survey.

of surveys of those cities was that of a board of education which usurped the authority of the superintendent and reduced the superintendency to a subordinate position.

Another address, by G. D. Strayer, before the Department of School Administration, voices the same feeling¹ regarding the handicaps of the superintendency:

It is unfortunate that the situation is as at present, a board that usurps the function of the executive, and whoever on that account forces him out of his position may confidently expect to find other competent men willing and anxious to accept the position so vacated.

²
Linn in 1918 wrote:

It is very hard for boards to come to the realization that they should have expert advice as to the location of buildings, as to plans and specifications for them, and as to their equipment.

Other evidence that we have not yet reached the functional goals to be desired in professional freedom in administration is not lacking. Current conversation and confidences among superintendents in the field too frequently reveal that the superintendent is a mere clerk rather than an educational administrator.

Since the leading educational administrators agree on what the goals of professional freedom are and that they are not often attained, the degree to which they

-
1. Strayer, G. D., Relation of Administrative Officers to Boards of Education; Proceedings of the N. E. A., Vol. 60, pp. 1229-1234.
 2. Linn, L. P., City/School Superintendent in General Legislation: Sch. & Soc., Vol. 8, Nov. 30, 1918, pp. 554-560.

have been achieved is of importance. Many empirical analyses which single out one or more factors as influencing the authority of the superintendent are current.

There are those who declare that the superintendent who has mastered all the details of school administration is the superintendent who is given a free hand in the control of his school system. Cubberley¹ refers to the value of training when he speaks of the superintendency as "a position for which careful preparation should be made, and, given equal native ability, the more careful has been the preparation, the larger is likely to be the ultimate success."

The factor of personality has its enthusiasts, as do tenure, type of board, size of city, diplomacy of superintendent, and experience. Undoubtedly, all of the above factors and some others are of effect -- negative or positive -- in determining the amount of authority the superintendent possesses. In what ratio each operates in determining the professional freedom of the superintendent can be ascertained only by scientific studies and analyses.

It is the object of this study to contribute to a knowledge of the influence which four factors -- training, experience, tenure, and size of city -- bring to bear

1. Cubberley, E. P., Public School Administration, Chap. 9, p.133.

upon the amount of authority which the superintendent assumes.

Chapter II.

LITERATURE AND INVESTIGATION RELATED TO THE FIELD OF THIS STUDY.

The literature that treats of the administrative function of the superintendent of schools is fairly extensive. Reference will be made to those publications which have been most helpful to the author.

A. History of the Superintendency.

First is that body of literature -- important because it reveals a steady growth in recognition of the superintendent's duties and authority -- that discloses the history of the superintendency. The knowledge that the office of superintendent of schools has increased in professionalism and dignity is encouraging after a frank recognition of the fact that the administrative situation is not yet ideal in many school systems.

"The earlier school legislation delegated the local enforcement of the same to civil authorities, such as the selectmen and grandjurymen of Connecticut, and the township clerk of Ohio." ¹ Morrison's account of the historical development of the office of superintendent of schools is quite illuminative. He chooses as type studies the evolution of the superintendency in Connecticut and in Ohio.

1. Morrison, J. C., Legal Status of the City School Superintendent, Chap. II, p. 37.

The growth of the office in Connecticut passed through the three stages of (a) lay control, (b) ecclesiastical control, and (c) professional control. There is no sharp line of demarcation between any two of the periods.

The period of lay control began in 1650 and extended roughly to the supplanting of the school committee by ecclesiastical societies in 1795. At the beginning of the period town selectmen were authorized to "have a vigilant eye over their brethren and neighbors, to see, first, that none of them shall suffer so much barbarism in any of their families, as not to endeavor to teach, by themselves and others, their children and apprentices so much learning as may enable them perfectly to read the English tongue and knowledge of the capital laws . . . " ¹

After selectmen control, grandjurymen and later a school committee shared the control of the schools with the ministers of the town.

About 1795 the schools of Connecticut were placed in the hands of ecclesiastical societies, thereby beginning the regime of clergy control proper. As supervisory officers each School Society had a board of visitors. "This change proved highly advantageous some time, but from want of a more specific enumeration, and some

1. Barnard, Henry, Old Hartford School, p.171.

modification of their powers, to adapt them to the altered circumstances of the schools, and of society, the great object of their appointment from year to year in a measure failed."¹

The act of 1839 more distinctly defined the authority of school visitors and enlarged their powers. It was in 1840 that Henry Barnard, as one of the school visitors,² made his proposal:

It is also proposed for the purpose of giving efficiency to the action of the Board, that they elect a superintendent who shall visit the schools, employ the teachers, meet with them for instruction, visit the parents and guardians of such children as are not sent to school at all, or attend irregularly, see to the repairs and management of the school-houses; in fine, to devote his whole time to the prosperity of the schools.

Barnard's plan was denounced as "the impracticable schemes of an enthusiast."³ In 1849 there were just four cities in the United States which employed school superintendents. These cities with the date of first appointment of superintendents were:⁴

Louisville, Kentucky,	1837
Buffalo, New York,	1837
Providence, Rhode Island,	1839
Springfield, Massachusetts,	1840

Though Barnard's plan was discredited in 1840, it later came into general use. After 1870, particularly,

-
1. Morrison, J. C., Legal Status of the City School Superintendent, Chap. II, pp. 15-16.
 2. Barnard, Henry, Old Hartford School, p. 240.
 3. Ibid, p. 241.
 4. Cubberley, E. P., Public School Administration, Chap. II, p. 58.

did the movement to head school systems with professional superintendents gain a decided impetus.

In Connecticut in 1855 the professional superintendent was suggested in a proposed revision of the school laws. At that time the Trustees of the State Normal School proposed that the Board of Visitors "elect one outside their number 'even a non-resident of the town' as superintendent."¹ In 1886 the state law provided that the superintendent might not be a member of the Board of Visitors.

In 1903 the superintendent of schools was obliged to be certificated by the State Board of Education. This was decidedly a professional requirement. Six years later legislation recognized, conclusively, the value of professional superintendence.

In Ohio lay control of the schools passed gradually and directly into professional control.

The following quotation shows the extent of lay¹ control in 1813:

Every township clerk was made superintendent of common schools within his township, his duties included visiting all the schools annually, inspecting the teachers' records, observing the management and making suggestions to teachers . . . "

With more or less authority clerks of the township board persisted as superintending agencies until

1. Morrison, J. C., Legal Status of the City School Superintendent, Chap. II. p. 28.

1873, when boards were empowered to elect a clerk who might not be a member of the School Board, a superintendent and assistant superintendent of schools. In addition to routine work the law declared the superintendent of schools was to make suggestions and recommendations regarding educational matters.

The practices and legislation of Connecticut and Ohio are fairly indicative of the procedure by which the other states evolved a professional school officer with such powers as we now find vested in the superintendency.

B. Legal Status of the Superintendent.

The second section of literature related to the author's study treats of the legal status of the superintendent in his administrative capacity. The investigations of Morrison, Linn, and Randall and Stone will be reviewed.

Morrison has tabulated information regarding the legal status of the city superintendent in all the states where such exist. The portions of his tabulation which are of particular significance to this work are his findings in regard to tenure and in regard to the five different conceptions of the office of superintendent of schools.¹

1. Morrison, J. C., Legal Status of the City School Superintendent, Chap. III.

The legal contract length of tenure in Kansas is for a period of one year or a period of two years; in Missouri, one year; in Nebraska and in Oklahoma, one year or three years.¹

The various conceptions of the superintendency, which Morrison found prevalent, range from that conception which gives the board sole authority for the conduct of the schools to that which gives the superintendent the right to veto or approve acts of the board.

Both Morrison and Linn have reviewed the state laws to find the legal authority of the superintendent over a number of school administrative functions.²

Linn's tabulation is most relevant to the author's investigation for a variety of reasons. His list of twenty-two functions includes twelve functions which are related to the present study. Linn indicates the number of functions each of the twelve opinions cites as properly belonging to the superintendent. The names of the educators whose opinions Linn tabulates, the symbols by which he designates each name, and how many of the twelve items of authority each educator thinks the superintendent should possess are given as follows:

-
1. Morrison, J. C., Legal Status of the City School Superintendent, Chap. III.
 2. Linn, L. F., The City School Superintendent in General Legislation: Sch. & Soc., Nov. 30, 1918, pp. 654-660.

Robbitt, Franklin,	B	8 items;
Cubberley, E. P.,	C	10 items;
Davidson, W. A.,	Da	8 items;
Denfield, R. E.,	De	4 items;
Dexter, A. G.,	Dx	4 items;
Dowden, F. E.,	Do	5 items;
Draper, A. S.,	Dr	2 items;
N. T. A. Committee, 1895,	5	5 items;
N. T. A. Committee, 1917,	N	5 items;
Rollins, Frank,	R	2 items;
Strayer, G. D.,	S	7 items;
Theisen, W. W.,	T	11 items.

From Linn's table, which lists functions of the superintendent, twelve functions are re-assembled below. The first number to the right of function indicates the number of authorities who agree that this function is the duty of the superintendent. The second number to the right of the function indicates the number of states that have made the function legally the duty of the superintendent. The symbols below the name of a function refer to educational authorities. Below the symbols are the names of the states which have legalized the function as the duty of the superintendent. The functions follow:

1. Initiation or control in the appointment of teachers. 12 12
B, C, Da, Dr, 5, R, Do, De, Dx, N, S, T.
Ill., Conn., Ind., Ky., Maine, Mass., Mich.,
N. D., N. C., Ohio, Penn., Wis.
2. Construct and change course of study. 12 7
B, C, Da, De, Do, Dr., Dx, 5, N, R, S, T.
Ill., Mass., Mich., N. D., Penn., Wash., Wis.
3. Initiative in assignment of teachers. 7 3
B, C, Da, Dx, 5, S, T.
Ill., Ky., Va.

-
1. Linn, L. P., The City School Superintendent in General Legislation, Sch. & Soc., Nov. 30, 1918, pp. 654-660.

4.	Approve plans for buildings. B, C, Da, De, N, S, T. Ill., Penn. (Supt. of Buildings prepares subject to criticism.), Va.	7	3
5.	Initiative in dismissal of teachers. C, Da, De, S, T. Ill., Ind.	6	2
6.	Select apparatus. B, C, De, Dx, N, T. Ill. (Educational), Ind., Ky., Maine	6	4
7.	Be executive officer of the board B, C, Da, S, T. Idaho, Ill., Mass., Mich., Mont.	5	5
8.	Select physical equipment. B, Do, S, T. Ill. (Educational)	4	1
9.	Draw up annual budget B, C, N, T.	4	0
10.	Suspend teachers. C, S, T. Ind., Ky., N. J. (With permission of president of board.), Ohio, N. C. (With concurrence of board), Mich.	3	6
11.	Attend meetings with right to speak C, Da, Do Ill., N. J., Va., Penn.	3	4
12.	Promote teachers. S, T. Ill., Ky.	2	2

As will be seen, none of the twelve functions mentioned in Linn's study is directly legalized in Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, and Oklahoma.

There are two opinions as to whether or not the functions to be exercised by the superintendent of schools should be legalized by statutory law.

One school of thought champions legislation which shall state definitely the authority of the superintendent in educational administration. Dean Chadsey, in a speech before the Department of Superintendence, said:¹

I am hoping that the time will come when we will see on the statute books of our states some definition of the superintendent and some statement as to the duties which, as a matter of law, adhere to the office, and when that time comes, many of the embarrassments under which individual members at times labor will be avoided.

Opponents of legislation that will further empower the superintendent object on several grounds. Some superintendents declare that legislation is unnecessary and that it might curb the authority of many able men who are in complete control of their school systems. Other opponents say that superintendents, as a whole, are not trained to perform all the executive functions which might be assigned them.

²
Morrison's study as to what status should be given the city school superintendent is particularly relevant to this phase of the subject. He investigated the opinions of school officials in cities which range in population from 2500 to nearly one million and which are

-
1. Chadsey, C. E., Report of the Committee on the Status of the Superintendent: Proceedings of the N. E. A., 1923.
 2. Morrison, J. C., Legal Status of the City School Superintendent, pp. 119-120.

distributed throughout 37 states of the Union.

Morrison tabulated 150 replies, of which 50 were from board members and 100 from superintendents and teachers of education. He found that the percentage of board members who would have the superintendent initiate action in the appointment of janitors, preparation of budget, and preparation of building plans to be small. Likewise, few board members would give the superintendent sole executive authority in the appointment of teachers, the appointment of janitors, transfer of teachers, dismissal of teachers, preparation of budget, construction plans, introduction of new policies, and the buying of supplies other than educational.

Stone and Randall¹ in their study in the state of Washington asked 170 superintendents if they were in favor of having their administrative difficulties dealt with by state law; 61 superintendents were in favor of a state law on such matters and 44 were not.

C. Analyses of Board Rules.

Since Linn and Morrison found that in many states there is little legislation that empowers the superintendent of schools with administrative functions, he must derive, tacitly or by board rules, most of his

1. Stone, C. W., & Randall, C. R., The Superintendent and His School Board: American School Board Journal, Oct. 1925.

authority from the board of education. What, then, is the trend of board regulations with relation to the recognition of the superintendent's authority?

¹
Theisen's study of the board rules of 100 cities demonstrated that school boards in many cities did not seek the advice of the superintendent when planning or constructing school buildings. In only seven cities was the superintendent asked to view the plans.

The board rules of 80% of the 100 cities did not mention the superintendent as having made or having assisted in the making of the budget. Theisen's other findings will be referred to later.

²
Ballou, in his investigation of the power of the superintendent of schools, divided cities into three classes according to population. The portion of his study that treats of his findings in regard to the appointment of teachers is particularly pertinent to the author's investigation.

In the group of largest cities (population over 300,000) Ballou found that the superintendent made the appointment of teachers and that the board approved it.

-
1. Theisen, W. W., City School Superintendent and Board of Education, p. 121.
 2. Ballou, F. W., The Appointment of Teachers in Cities, Chap. 2.

In cities between 100,000 and 300,000 in population the superintendent took the initial step in the appointment of teachers and the board or a committee of the board appointed. In cities smaller than 100,000 the superintendent did not take the initial step; neither did he appoint teachers, but the board of education controlled appointment.

1

From Ballou's study of board rules it is evident that as the cities decrease in size the authority of the superintendent over the appointment of teachers diminishes.

In summarizing the functions in which the superintendent is authorized to act by board legislation, as revealed by board rules, a conclusion of Theisen well expresses the situation:

2

From the data presented with respect to the authority granted the chief executive in purely professional matters, we see that there are boards in no small number who have not yet solved the problem of judicious distribution of lay and professional control.

D. Miscellaneous Studies.

-
1. Ballou, F. W., The Appointment of Teachers in Cities, Chap. 2.
 2. Theisen, W. W., City School Superintendent and Board of Education, p. 124.

The author's investigation is indebted to Randall and Stone's study¹ of the preparation, relationship, and problems of superintendents, for several items of technique. Stone and Randall's study is the result of a tabulation of 170 questionnaires from districts of the second class (those with smaller school systems) in the state of Washington.

They found that the superintendent is reasonably well prepared: 84% were college graduates, 73% had graduate work, and 20% had a graduate degree.

The average total experience of superintendents in second class districts in the state of Washington was 14.5 years; as grade principal, 1 year; as high school principal, 1.5 years.

For comparisons of the training, experience, and tenure of superintendents in the four states of Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, and Oklahoma, with the median of training, experience, and tenure of superintendents in the Great Plains Section and in the United States, the "First Year-book of the Department of Superintendence" was of considerable value to the present essay.

1. Stone, C. W., & Randall, C. R., The Superintendent and His Board: American School Board Journal, Oct., 1925, pp. 39-40.

Chapter III.

SPECIFIC FIELD OF STUDY.

A. Definition of the Field of Study.

This study lies within the scope of the administration of public schools. More specifically, it is in the field of city school organization and administration. The investigation is related closely to certain principles¹ for judging the efficiency of a school system and the theory² of the division of functions.

This study purposes to disclose such correlations as may exist between the authority of the city school superintendent and his training, experience, tenure, and the size of city in which he is employed.

School systems in the four states of Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, and Oklahoma -- the Great Plains (Agricultural)³ Section -- were used to obtain data for this investigation. Those cities⁴ with populations from 1,000 to 15,000, inclusive, were selected.

B. Limitation of Field of Study.

Certain limitations of the field of study for

-
1. Sears, J. B., The School Survey.
 2. Cubberley, E. P., Public School Administration.
 3. Evenden, E.S., Teachers' Salaries and Salary Schedules in the United States, 1918-19: Proceedings of the N. E. A., p. 9.
 4. U. S. Census. 1920.

reasons of expediency and in order to secure uniformity seemed advisable.

The investigation is restricted to certain types of school systems. No private schools in the four states are included. Consolidated schools in Kansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma, are excluded. All separately maintained high school systems, such as the rural high school and the community high school (Kansas) are omitted in Kansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma. Since the Nebraska directory¹ does not mark consolidated and rural high school systems, a few of those systems in Nebraska may be included in the study.

Those superintendents whose answers are the basis of the study are in office in the school year of 1925-26.

The investigation is not intended, primarily, to tabulate difficulties between superintendents and school boards, though some data on annoyances are included, incidentally.

C. Definition of Terms.

The officials styled "superintendents" in this study are so classed in the educational directories of 1925-26 for the states of Kansas, Missouri, Oklahoma, and Nebraska. They are also the administrative heads of school

1. Nebraska Educational Directory, 1925-26.

systems similar to the schools included in this investigation.

D. Selection and Classification of Cities.

The cities for this investigation were chosen from all parts of the respective states. In Kansas 70 cities are represented; in Missouri, 66 cities; in Nebraska, 34 cities; and in Oklahoma, 30 cities.

The cities were put into five groups according to population.¹ See Table I.

TABLE I. THE POPULATION RANGE OF EACH GROUP, INTO WHICH THE CITIES OF THIS STUDY WERE CLASSIFIED.

CITY GROUP	POPULATION OF CITY
1	1,000 -- 1,999
2	2,000 -- 3,999
3	4,000 -- 6,999
4	7,000 -- 9,999
5	10,000 -- 15,000

(All population figures are inclusive.)

1. U. S. Census, 1920.

Chapter IV.

COLLECTION OF DATA

A. Sources of Data.

Data were collected from (a) checked questionnaires, (b) educational directories of Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, and Oklahoma (year 1925-26), (c) the United States Census for 1920, (d) catalogs of the four state universities, and (e) the "Circular of Higher Education", U. S. Bur. of Ed., No. 30.

A reference to the questionnaire, a copy of which is found in the appendix, will show in detail the information asked superintendents concerning their authority, training, experience, and tenure.

Educational directories supplied the names of cities and superintendents. They were also used for checking certain items of information supplied by the superintendent.

The United States Census was used in securing the population of cities, so that they might be classified as previously stated.

University catalogs almost entirely supplied the list of courses on the questionnaire. The "Circular of Higher Education" was helpful in that it compared the appellations by which certain courses are known.

B. Distribution of Questionnaires.

In order to determine whether or not the questionnaire was subject to mis-interpretation, a trial questionnaire was tried out in the early part of 1926 on a group of students in the seminar class.

After some revisions and additions had been made, 36 questionnaires, 12 to each Kansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma, were sent to superintendents. Since the results from this second trial questionnaire were satisfactory and the form was not changed again, those of the 36 questionnaires which were returned are included in the investigation.

In the month of February 264 questionnaires, making the total 300, were mailed to city superintendents in Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, and Oklahoma. Table II shows the distribution by states. Table III shows the number sent to each city group.

C. Assemblage of Questionnaires

Table II shows the number and percent of questionnaires returned by states.

TABLE II. THE DISTRIBUTION AND ASSEMBLAGE OF QUESTIONNAIRES

State	No. Sent	No. Returned	Percent Returned
Kansas	100	70	70%
Missouri	100	66	66%
Nebraska	50	34	68%
Oklahoma	50	30	60%
Total	300	200	66 2/3%

Table III shows the percent of questionnaires returned in the city groups of each state.

TABLE III. THE DISTRIBUTION AND ASSEMBLAGE OF QUESTIONNAIRES BY STATES AND CITY GROUPS

City Group	Kansas		Missouri		Nebraska		Oklahoma	
	# A	% B	A	B	A	B	A	B
1	40	67.5	42	53.2	13	76.9	16	52.6
2	37	72.9	32	71.8	19	78.9	20	60.
3	12	66.6	15	73.3	11	63.6	10	50
4	7	71.4	5	100.	4	25.	3	100.
5	4	75.	6.	83.3	3	33.3	1	100.
Total	100	70.%	100	66%	50	68.%	50	60.%

// Column A gives the number sent out in each group for each state; column B gives the percent returned in each group for each state.

This table should be read, "Forty questionnaires were sent to city group 1 in Kansas. Of these 40 questionnaires, 67.5% were returned."

Chapter V.

PRESENTATION OF DATA ON TRAINING, EXPERIENCE, TENURE, AND
SIZE OF CITYA. Training of SuperintendentsTABLE IV. PROFESSIONAL COURSES AS LISTED IN THE QUESTION-
NAIRE, ARRANGED IN THE ORDER OF FREQUENCY,
200 SUPERINTENDENTS REPLYING.

Professional Course	Superintendents				
	Kan.	Mo.	Neb.	Okla.	Total Fre- quency
Educational Psychology	67	62	34	28	191
Supervision of Instruction	61	57	31	24	173
Secondary School Admini- stration	61	58	26	26	171
City School Administration	63	52	29	26	170
Curriculum Construction (Elementary or High School)	45	49	22	17	133
Educational Statistics	43	40	23	21	127
School Hygiene and Health	39	40	17	16	112
School Law	49	23	15	21	108
School Surveys	29	29	23	24	105
School Finance	33	25	17	13	88
Research in Education	31	27	13	15	86
Buildings (Problems in Administration)	25	24	16	8	73
Course in Vocational Edu- cation	20	18	6	10	54
Comparative Education	12	11	7	12	42

The training of city school superintendents was investigated from the angle of amount of professional training in administration and the extent of all scholastic training.

The questionnaire listed 14 professional courses which were judged to be of value to the school superintendent in his official capacity. Superintendents were asked to check those courses which they had studied. Table IV shows the professional courses studied by superintendents arranged in the order of frequency.

Decidedly outstanding among the professional courses listed in the formal preparation of the superintendent are Supervision of Instruction, City School Administration, and Secondary School Administration, all of which courses 75% or more of the superintendents have studied.

In addition to the courses named above, at least 50% of the superintendents reported they had included in their programs of study Curriculum Construction, Educational Statistics, School Hygiene and Health, School Law, and School Surveys.

Some purely administrative courses such as School Finance and School Buildings were not reported as frequently as less specialized courses. There are several reasons for this. Such courses are frequently graduate courses; they are relatively new. They may not be offered at the

educational institutions of the different states. Further, certain of the superintendents may have only the minimum requirement in education due to their having majored in a department other than education during their undergraduate days.

A certain uniformity in regard to the proportion of superintendents in each state who had studied a certain course was evident. For example, School Supervision had been a part of the training in:

Nebraska of 91.1% of the superintendents;
Kansas of 87.1% of the superintendents;
Missouri of 86.3% of the superintendents;
Oklahoma of 80. % of the superintendents;

City School Administration, which was ranked fourth in total frequency of professional administrative courses, shows less uniformity in the proportion of the superintendents in each state who have studied it. It has been a part of the professional education of:

90. % of the superintendents in Kansas;
86.6% of the superintendents in Oklahoma;
85.2% of the superintendents in Nebraska;
78.7% of the superintendents in Missouri.

The variance of proportion for School Finance was from 37.8% of the superintendents in Missouri to 50.% of the superintendents in Nebraska.

For School Buildings the variation was from 26.6% of the superintendents in Oklahoma to 47% of the superintendents in Nebraska.

TABLE V. ADDITIONAL COURSES WHICH SUPERINTENDENTS STATED
WERE OF VALUE TO THEM AS SUPERINTENDENTS

Course	Number of Superintendents				
	Kan.	Mo.	Neb.	Okla.	Total Fre- quency
¹ Educational Tests and Measurements	8	12	5	4	29
History of Education	6	7	3	1	17
Educational Sociology	5	1	3	1	10
Philosophy of Education	6	0	4	0	10
Principles of Education	5	2	0	0	7
Mental Testing	2	0	2	2	6
Junior High School	4	1	0	0	5
High School Problems	0	5	0	0	5
Social Psychology	4	0	0	0	4
Child Psychology	2	0	0	2	4
Adolescence	1	0	1	0	2
Special Methods in Teaching	0	1	1	0	2
School Publicity	0	2	0	0	2
Methods and Management	2	0	0	0	2
Teaching Staff	2	0	0	0	2
Psychology of High School Subjects	2	0	0	0	2
Theory and Practice	2	0	0	0	2

1. This course was inadvertently omitted from the questionnaire.

TABLE V. (CONTINUED.)

Course	Number of Superintendents				
	Kan.	Mo.	Neb.	Okla.	Total Fre- quency
Major Course for Superintendents	0	1	0	1	2
School Economy and Management	0	2	0	0	2
Revision of Examinations	1	0	0	0	1
Elementary School	1	0	0	0	1
Technique of Instruction	1	0	0	0	1
Psychology of Elementary Subjects	1	0	0	0	1
Educational Problems	1	0	0	0	1
General Methods and Observation	1	0	0	0	1
State and County Administration	1	0	0	0	1
Kindergarten Methods	1	0	0	0	1
School Discipline	1	0	0	0	1
Clinical Psychology	1	0	0	0	1
Administrative Functions of the Superintendent	0	1	0	0	1
Exceptional Children	0	1	0	0	1
Educational Methods	0	1	0	0	1
Seminar in Education	0	1	0	0	1
Principles of Teaching	0	1	0	0	1
The Teacher	0	1	0	0	1

TABLE V. (CONTINUED.)

Course	Number of Superintendents				
	Kan.	Mo.	Neb.	Okla.	Total Fre- quency
School and Community	0	1	0	0	1
Biological Theory of Education	0	0	1	0	1
Practicum	0	0	1	0	1
History of Education in the United States	0	0	1	0	1
Parent-Teachers Association	0	0	1	0	1
Duties of City Superintendent	0	0	0	1	1
Administrative Problems	0	0	0	1	1
Accounting	0	0	0	1	1
Principles of Advertising	0	0	0	1	1
Project Method	0	0	0	1	1
Activity Work	0	0	0	1	1
Athletics	0	0	0	1	1

In blank spaces provided on the questionnaire superintendents were asked to name any other courses which had been of direct value to them as superintendents. A total of 47 additional courses were so named, of which 28 courses were mentioned by one superintendent only. A few of the courses appear to be non-professional in nature.

TABLE VI. TRAINING AND TOTAL EXPERIENCE OF THE 200 SUPERINTENDENTS IN THE FOUR STATES.

TOTAL YEARS' EXPE- RIENCE	TRAINING OF SUPERINTENDENTS					Total
	No De- gree	Bache- lor's Degree	1-15 Hrs. Grad- uate Work	16-29 Hrs. Grad- uate Work	30 or More Hrs. Graduate Work, With or Without Mas- ter's Degree	
1-5	1	3	6	1		11
6-10	1	7	18	8	14	48
11-15		4	13	14	24	55
16-20	1	1	13	10	18	43
21-25		2	3	6	5	16
26-30	2	2	2	5	5	16
31-35	2	2		2	3	9
36 & more	1		1			2
Total	8	21	56	46	69	200

The amount of training, both academic and professional, in the four states, considered as a unit, shows a median of 20.5 hours' graduate work. This median accords with the median of training for the United States, as computed by the Committee on the Status of the Superintendent. In 1923 the Committee reported that it had found the median of training beyond the eighth grade to be 8.58 years.

This Committee also found the median of training for superintendents in the Great Plains Section to be 8.47 years above the eighth grade or slightly below the median

which this investigation found for the four states of Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, and Oklahoma.

Of the 200 superintendents 8 or 4% reported they held no bachelor's degree. See Table VI.

Of the 8 superintendents with no degree, 5 were persons of 30 or more years' experience; indeed, the median of experience for all who had no degree was 28.5 years.

The greatest number of superintendents with no degree are found in cities with a population of 1,000 to 1,999. See Table XXVIII, page 82.

Of the 200 superintendents of the study, 10.5% had the bachelor's degree but no graduate study. A variety of bachelor's degrees were reported, some of which were non-teaching, as the LL. B., reported by 2 superintendents in Kansas.

At the level of training of the bachelor's degree the median of total experience is 11.6 years.

More of the bachelor's degree superintendents were heads of school systems in cities of 2,000 to 3,999 than were in any other size of city. None was in control of school systems larger than 6,999 in population. See Table XXVIII, page 82.

Superintendents with from 1 to 15 hours (inclusive) of graduate work make up 28% of the chief school executives. See Table VI, for number of superintendents with 1 to 15 hours' advanced study.

Superintendents with from 1 to 15 hours' graduate work have a median of total experience of 12.5 years.

Superintendents with this degree of training are employed in all city groups, but over 42% are in city group 1 and over 42% are in city group 2.

Of the 200 superintendents 23% have 16 to 29 hours of advanced study. Table VI.

These persons have a median of total experience of 15.5 years.

They are employed in all of the five groups of cities. A greater number of them is employed in city-group 1, but in city-groups 2 and 3, over 23% and, 26%, respectively, have this amount of advanced training.

The last grouping according to educational attainment includes superintendents with 30 or more hours' graduate work. They may or may not have the Master's degree. These superintendents comprise 34.5% of the 200 superintendents. (Table VI).

The median of their total experience is 15.2 years.

More of these superintendents are employed in city-group 2 than in any other one group. However, over one-third of them are in cities larger than 3,999 in population.

TABLE VII. TRAINING AND TOTAL EXPERIENCE DISTRIBUTION
OF 70 SUPERINTENDENTS IN KANSAS.

TOTAL YEARS' EXPE- RIENCE	TRAINING OF SUPERINTENDENTS					Total
	No De- gree.	Bache- lor's Degree.	1-15 Hrs. Grad- uate Work.	16-29 Hrs. Grad- uate Work.	30 or More Hrs. Graduate Work, With or Without Mas- ter's Degree.	
1-5		1	3			4
6-10	1	2	4	2	5	14
11-15			4	4	6	14
16-20	1		6	3	8	18
21-25		2	2	2	1	7
26-30	1	1	1	2	2	7
31-35	1	1		1	2	5
36 & More	1					1
Total	5	7	20	14	24	70

The median of training for the 70 superintendents in Kansas is 19 hours of advanced study.

The training, expressed by percents, of these superintendents in Kansas is as follows:

7.1% have no degree;
10. % have the bachelor's degree;
28.6% have 1 to 15 hours' graduate work;
20.0% have 16 to 29 hours' graduate study;
34.3% have 30 or more hours of graduate study.

TABLE VIII. TRAINING-EXPERIENCE DISTRIBUTION OF
66 SUPERINTENDENTS IN MISSOURI.

TRAINING OF SUPERINTENDENTS						
TOTAL YEARS' EXPE- RIENCE	No De- Gree.	Bache- lor's Degree.	1-15 Hrs. Grad- uate Work	16-29 Hrs. Grad- uate Work.	30 or More Hrs. Graduate Work, With or Without Mas- ter's Degree	Total
1-5		1	2			3
6-10		2	9	3	5	19
11-15		1	7	6	4	18
16-20		1	3	5	3	12
21-25				3	2	5
26-30	1	1	1	2	1	6
31-35	1			1		2
36 & More			1			1
Total	2	6	23	20	15	66

The median of training for these superintendents is 17.4 hours of graduate work.

The training, expressed by percents, of these superintendents is as follows:

- 3. % have no degree;
- 9.1% have the bachelor's degree;
- 34.9% have from 1 to 15 hours' graduate work;
- 30.3% have from 16 to 29 hours' graduate work;
- 22.7% have 30 or more hours' graduate work.

In Missouri there was 1 superintendent who had no degree and who was employed in city-group 5.

TABLE IX. TRAINING-EXPERIENCE DISTRIBUTION OF 34
SUPERINTENDENTS IN NEBRASKA.

TOTAL YEARS' EXPE- RIENCE	TRAINING OF SUPERINTENDENTS					Total
	No De- gree	Bache- lor's Degree	1-15 Hrs. Grad- uate Work	16-29 Hrs. Grad- uate Work	30 or More Hrs. Graduate Work, With or Without Mas- ter's Degree.	
1-5				1		1
6-10			1	2	4	7
11-15		1	2	3	8	14
16-20			1		6	7
21-25			1		1	2
26-30					1	1
31-35		1			1	2
36 & More						0
Total	0	2	5	6	21	34

The median of training for superintendents falls in the group with 30 or more hours' graduate work.

The training, expressed by percents, of these superintendents is as follows:

- 0. % have no degree;
- 5.9% have the bachelor's degree;
- 14.7% have 1 to 15 hours' graduate work;
- 17.6% have 16 to 29 hours' graduate study;
- 61.8% have 30 or more hours' graduate study.

TABLE X. TRAINING-EXPERIENCE DISTRIBUTION OF 30 SUPERINTENDENTS IN OKLAHOMA

TRAINING OF SUPERINTENDENTS						
TOTAL YEARS' EXPE-	No De- gree.	Bache- lor's Degree	1-15 Hrs. Grad- uate Work.	16-29 Hrs. Grad- uate Work.	30 or More Hrs. Graduate Work, With or Without Mas- ter's Degree	Total
1-5	1	1	1			3
6-10		3	4	1		8
11-15		2		1	6	9
16-20			3	2	1	6
21-25				1	1	2
26-30				1	1	2
31-35						0
36 & More						
Total	1	6	8	6	9	30

The median of training for superintendents in Oklahoma is 15.5 hours' graduate work.

The training, expressed by percents, of these superintendents is as follows:

- 3.3% have no degree;
- 20. % have the bachelor's degree;
- 26.7% have 1 to 15 hours graduate study;
- 20. % have 16 to 29 hours' graduate study;
- 30. % have 30 or more hours' graduate work.

B. Experience.

1

TABLE XI. A FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF TOTAL EXPERIENCE
OF SUPERINTENDENTS IN EACH OF THE FOUR STATES.

Years	Kan.	Mo.	Neb.	Okla.	Total
1					0
2					0
3	1				1
4		1		2	3
5	3	2	1	1	7
6	1	1	1	2	5
7	1	2		2	5
8	1	5	1	1	8
9	7	6	2	2	17
10	4	5	3	1	13
11	5	5	4	1	15
12	3	4	5	4	16
13	1	3	4	1	9
14	4	4		2	10
15	2	2	1	1	6
16	5	3	1		9
17	3	1	1	1	6
18	2	3	1	2	8
19	3	1		1	5
20	4	4	4	2	14
21	1				1
22	1		1		2
23	3	2			5
24		2		1	3
25	2	1	1	1	5
26	4			1	5
27		2	1		3
28	2	1		1	4
29					0
30	1	3			4
31	1				1
32	2		1		3
33		1			1
34		1			1
35	2		1		3
36					0
37					0
38					0
39					0
40	1				1
41					0
42		1			1
Total	70	66	34	30	200

1. Total experience here means all experience in the teaching profession, whether classwork or administration.

The total experience of the 200 superintendents ranged from 3 to 43 years (inclusive) with a median of 14.1 years. See Table XI. The medians for the states were as follows:

Kansas, 16.4 years;
Missouri, 13.7 years;
Nebraska, 12.5 years;
Oklahoma, 12.7 years.

TABLE XII. THE PERCENTAGE OF SUPERINTENDENTS OF THIS STUDY IN EACH EXPERIENCE GROUP BY STATES.

Years' Total Experience	Kansas	Missouri	Nebraska	Oklahoma
1-5	5.7%	4.5%	2.9%	10. %
6-10	20. %	28.8%	20.6%	26.7%
11-15	20. %	27.2%	41.2%	30. %
16-20	25.7%	18.2%	20.6%	20. %
21-25	10. %	7.6%	5.9%	6.7%
26-30	10. %	9.1%	2.9%	6.7%
31-35	7.1%	3. %	5.9%	0.
36 & More	1.4	1.5	0.	0.

In Kansas and Missouri the proportion of superintendents who have had more than 30 years' total experience is small, while in Oklahoma and Nebraska few superintendents have had more than 20 years' total experience.

Only in Oklahoma does as great a proportion as 10% have less than 6 years' total experience.

In the case of superintendents with 1 to 10

years' (inclusive) total experience the median of training for the four states is 1 to 15 hours of advanced study. With a total experience of 11 to 35 years the median of training increases to between 16 and 29 hours' graduate work. After 35 years' total experience the median of training is a bachelor's degree. Table VI, page 39.

In Kansas and Missouri the relation between experience and training follows the same general trend.

In Nebraska superintendents with 1 to 15 years' total experience have a median of training between 16 and 29 hours' graduate work. With 16 to 35 years' total experience the median of training lies in 30 or more hours' advanced study. See Table IX, page 44.

In Oklahoma with 1 to 5 years' total experience the median of training is the bachelor's degree. In the case of superintendents who have from 6 to 10 years' total experience the median of training is between 1 and 15 hours advanced study. Between 11 and 15 years' total experience the median lies in 30 or more hours' graduate study. After 15 years' total experience the median of training is 16 to 29 hours' graduate work. See Table X, page 45.

TABLE XIII. TYPES OF ADMINISTRATIVE EXPERIENCE OF
200 SUPERINTENDENTS IN THE FOUR STATES.

Type of Experience	No. Supts. Who [#] Reported.				Median Years' Service			
	Kan.	Mo.	Neb.	Okla.	Kan.	Mo.	Neb.	Okla.
Elementary Principals Who Taught In Connection With Their Administrative Work	25	24	4	14	2.7	3.2	3.5	2.5
Elementary Principals Who Did Administrative Work Exclusively	1	2	0	1	6.	5.5	0.	4.
High School Principals Who Taught In Connection With Their Administrative Work.	46	47	17	22	2.8	3.2	3.9	2.8
High School Principals Who Did Administrative Work Exclusively	2	4	0	1	1.5	2.5	0.	3.
Supts. Who Taught In Connection With Their Administrative Work	67	52	33	25	7.9	6.4	7.7	6.5
Supts. Who Did Administrative Work Exclusively	36	33	18	17	3.3	4.7	4.5	4.6

[#] The total number of superintendents who reported in all cases exceeds the number of superintendents who reported for Kansas, Missouri, etc., because many superintendents reported more than one type of administrative experience.

Read this table: Twenty-five of the superintendents who reported from Kansas have been elementary principal and taught some classes in conjunction with their

administrative work. They have a median of 2.7 years' experience as elementary principals with teaching.

A much greater percentage of superintendents had served as high school principals than had served as elementary principals. In a majority of instances superintendents had taught classes at the time they were employed as high school principals. In Nebraska none of the superintendents reported that they had done high school administrative work, exclusively. See Table XIII.

That the superintendent of schools has been a high school principal more often than he has been an elementary principal is in accord with what was determined¹ by the Committee on the Status of the Superintendent for the United States.

Of the 200 superintendents, 177 or 88.5% reported that they were now doing teaching in connection with their administrative duties or that they had held positions as superintendents where they had taught classes in connection with administration.

Of the 200 superintendents, 104 or 52% reported that they were now holding superintendencies where they did no teaching or that they had, in the past, held superintendencies where they did no teaching.

1. The Status of the Superintendent, First Yearbook of the Department of Superintendence, 1923, pp. 48-56.

C. Tenure of the Superintendent

TABLE XIV. TENURE IN PRESENT POSITION.

Years	Kan.	No.	Neb.	Okla.	Total
1	11	17	6	9	43
2	15	16	5	4	38
3	11	6	2	9	28
4	8	5	12	4	29
5	6	4	3	1	14
6	3	5	1		9
7	5	3	4	3	15
8	3	2			5
9	2	1	1		4
10		2			2
11	2				2
12		1			1
13	2	1			3
14					0
15		1			1
16					0
17					0
18	2				2
19					0
20					0
21	1				1
22					0
23		1			1
24	1	1			2
Total	70	66	34	30	200

For the 200 superintendents the median length of tenure of present position is 3.7 years. The Committee on the Status of the Superintendent found that the tenure of the superintendent of schools in the United States has been only three years. The median tenure for the Great Plains Section was found by the Committee to be 4 years, or slightly higher than for the four states of this investigation.

The total range of tenure was from 1 to 24 years. In Missouri and in Kansas the range of tenure of present position was much greater than ranges of tenure in Nebraska and in Oklahoma.

Those superintendents who had been in office for 1 year (the present year, 1925-26) constituted over a fifth of the 200 superintendents. The following percents show how frequently there is a turnover in superintendents:

21.5% had been in their present position 1 year;
 19. % had been in their present positions 2 years;
 14. % had been in their present positions 3 years;
 14.5% had been in their present positions 4 years;
 7. % had been in their present positions 5 years.

A comparison of one-year tenure in the four states reveals that of the superintendents:

25.7% in Missouri have held present position 1 year;
 30. % in Oklahoma have held present position 1 year;
 17.6% in Nebraska have held present position 1 year;
 15.7% in Kansas have held present position 1 year.

"One year" includes the present year of tenure.

A comparison of the two-year tenure in the four states shows that of the superintendents;

24.3% in Missouri have held present position 2 years;
 18.5% in Kansas have held present position 2 years;
 13.3% in Oklahoma have held present position 2 years;
 14.7% in Nebraska have held present position 2 years.

A comparison of three-year tenure reveals that:

30. % in Oklahoma have held present position 3 years;
 15.7% in Kansas have held present position 3 years;
 9.1% in Missouri have held present position 3 years;
 5.8% in Nebraska have held present position 3 years.

A comparison of four-year tenure in the four states shows that of the superintendents:

35.2% in Nebraska have held present position 4 years;
 13.3% in Oklahoma have held present position 4 years;
 11.4% in Kansas have held present position 4 years;
 7.6% in Missouri have held present position 4 years.

Possibly the longer legal period of contract causes Nebraska and Oklahoma to rank high in three and four year tenure.

Tenure medians in the various city groups indicate, in the main, an increase in tenure as city-groups are larger:

3.1 years is median tenure in city-group 1;
 3.56 years is median tenure in city-group 2;
 4.5 years is median tenure in city group 3;
 3.75 years is median tenure in city group 4;
 5.5 years is median tenure in city group 5.

D. Size of City.

TABLE XV. SIZE OF CITY-TRAINING DISTRIBUTION OF SUPERINTENDENTS IN KANSAS.

POP- ULA- TION OF CITY	TRAINING OF SUPERINTENDENTS					Total
	No De- gree	Bache- lor's Degree	1-15 Hrs. Grad- uate Work	16-29 Hrs. Grad- uate Work.	30 or More Hrs. Graduate Work, With or Without Mas- ter's Degree	
10,000- 15,000				1	2	3
7,000- 9,999			1	1	3	5
4,000- 6,999		1	1	4	2	8
2,000- 3,999	1	3	8	4	11	27
1,000- 1,999	4	3	10	4	6	27
Total	5	7	20	14	24	70

TABLE XVI. SIZE OF CITY-TRAINING DISTRIBUTION OF
66 SUPERINTENDENTS IN MISSOURI.

SIZE OF CITY	TRAINING OF SUPERINTENDENTS					Total
	No De- gree.	Bache- lor's Degree	1-15 Hrs. Grad- uate Work.	16-29 Hrs. Grad- uate Work	30 or More Hrs. Graduate Work Without Mas- ter's Degree	
10,000- 15,000	1		1	2	1	5
7,000- 9,999			2	1	2	5
4,000- 6,999	1		1	5	4	11
2,000- 3,999		5	8	4	6	23
1,000- 1,999		1	11	8	2	22
Total	2	6	23	20	15	66

TABLE XVII. SIZE OF CITY-TRAINING DISTRIBUTION OF 34
SUPERINTENDENTS IN NEBRASKA.

SIZE OF CITY	TRAINING OF SUPERINTENDENTS					Total
	No De- gree	Bache- lor's Degree	1-15 Hrs. Grad- uate Work	16-29 Hrs. Grad- uate Work	30 or More Hrs. Graduate Work, With or Without Mas- ter's Degree	
10,000- 15,000					1	1
7,000- 9,999					1	1
4,000- 6,999				1	6	7
2,000- 3,999		2	4	1	8	15
1,000- 1,999			1	4	5	10
Total		2	5	6	21	34

TABLE XVIII. SIZE OF CITY-TRAINING DISTRIBUTION OF
30 SUPERINTENDENTS IN OKLAHOMA.

SIZE OF CITY	TRAINING OF SUPERINTENDENTS					Total
	No De- Gree	Bache- lor's Degree	1-15 Hrs. Grad- uate Work	16-29 Hrs. Grad- uate Work	30 or More Hrs. Graduate Work, With or Without Mas- ter's Degree	
10,000- 15,000					1	1
7,000- 9,000			1	1	1	3
4,000- 6,999		2	1	2		5
2,000- 3,999		1	4	2	5	12
1,000- 1,999	1	3	2	1	2	9
Total	1	6	8	6	9	30

E. Summary of Chapter V.

A brief summary of the data on training, experience, tenure, and size of city completes Chapter V.

City School Administration, Secondary School Administration, and Supervision of Instruction have been a part of the training of 75% or more of the superintendents.

Some purely administrative courses such as School Finance and School Buildings have not been studied by superintendents as frequently as have more general courses.

City School Administration ranks fourth in the

frequency in which it has been studied by superintendents.

The median of training for the 200 superintendents is 20.5 hours of graduate work.

Of the 200 superintendents 4% hold no degree; 10.5%, the bachelor's degree; 28. % have 1 to 15 hours' graduate work; 23%, 16 to 29 hours' graduate work; and 34.5%, 30 or more hours' graduate work.

The total experience of the 200 superintendents had a median of 14.1 years.

As experience increases, up to 35 years, training usually increases. After 35 years of total experience training tends to fall back to the bachelor's degree.

More superintendents have had experience as high school principal than have had experience as elementary principals.

In the four states, considered as a unit, the median tenure is 3.7 years.

About one-fifth of the superintendents changed positions last year.

Tenure medians in the five groups of cities show, on the whole, an increase as cities become larger.

Chapter VI.

PRESENTATION OF DATA ON THE DISTRIBUTION OF FUNCTIONS IN
ADMINISTRATIONTABLE XIX. DISTRIBUTION OF FUNCTIONS OF SUPERINTENDENTS
AND SCHOOL BOARDS IN THE FOUR STATES

Function.	Supt.	Board.	Both.
Who approves general plans for new buildings?	10	10	148
Who grants permission for the use of school buildings for public meetings?	102	57	39
Who recommends teachers for employment?	181	3	16
Who assigns teachers?	190	4	6
Who transfers teachers from one grade to another or from one building to another?	176	9	11
In case the board has a salary schedule, who presented the idea?	113	5	4
Who constructed the salary schedule?	64	2	59
Who determines the salary for each teacher?	69	70	69
Who appoints substitutes?	184	12	3
Who sets pay for substitutes?	95	65	17
Who prepares the budget?	59	18	118
Who recommends the purchase of supplies and equipment?	147	1	50
Who appoints new janitors?	24	138	34
Who determines new janitors' salaries?	12	155	22

TABLE XIX. (CONTINUED.)

Function.	Supt.	Board.	Both.
Who prescribes detailed duties of janitors?	153	20	20
Who removes inefficient and in-subordinate janitors?	41	103	36
Who initiates the movement to place new subjects in the curriculum?	192	2	3
Who initiates the movement to discard subjects from the curriculum?	189	0	5
Who determines the observance of holidays?	72	78	50
Who determines the length of holiday recesses?	57	74	63
Who determines the school's policy regarding athletics?	157	11	26
Who introduces new policies for the school?	167	2	24

Ten different types of administrative functions in school systems are considered. Three different distributions of each of these functions are made possible in the investigation. That is, with a few exceptions, a function may be exercised by (a) the superintendent, (b) the board of education, or (c) both the superintendent and the board of education.

Table XIX, pages 58-59 shows the agents by which certain functions are exercised in Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, and Oklahoma, treated as a unit.

Table XX, page 61, compares the authority of the superintendent in the four states.

Table XXI, pages 63-64 compares the authority of the board of education in the four states. Table XXII, pages 65-66, compares the authority of both board and superintendent in the four states.

Table XXIII, page 71, shows the school boards' attitude toward the recommendations of the superintendent regarding dismissal of teachers and expulsion of pupils; this table also shows the boards' practice in regard to recommendations and grievances of teachers, principals, and patrons.

A. Buildings.

In 168 of the 200 school systems school buildings have been planned or constructed during the administration of the present superintendent.

Regarding the approval of plans for construction of these buildings, neither superintendent nor board, alone, approves plans very frequently. See Table XIX. The approval of both superintendent and board is, by far, the most common procedure.

The authority of the superintendent alone is more marked in granting permission for the use of school buildings for public meetings. In over 50% of the school systems this power is delegated to the superintendent alone.

TABLE XX. PERCENTAGE OF SUPERINTENDENTS IN EACH STATE
THAT EXERCISE AUTHORITY IN THE FUNCTIONS LISTED.

Function	Total Number of Supts. Re- plying			
	70 in Kan.	66 in Mo.	34 in Neb.	30 in Okla.
Supt. approves general plans for new buildings.	2.4	18.8	21.4	0.
Supt. grants permission for the use of school build- ings for public meetings.	52.9	42.4	58.8	56.7
Supt. recommends teachers for employment.	87.1	90.9	100.	86.7
Supt. assigns teachers	95.7	92.4	97.1	96.7
Supt. transfers teachers from one grade to another or from one building to another.	88.6	83.3	94.1	90.
Supt. presented the salary schedule idea.	87.5	86.8	100.	94.4
Supt. constructed the sal- ary schedule	45.7	47.4	61.9	66.7
Supt. determines the sal- ary for each teacher.	27.1	42.4	32.3	36.7
Supt. appoints substitutes	98.6	88.3	94.1	93.3
Supt. sets pay for substi- tutes.	47.1	46.9	47.1	50.
Supt. prepares budget	27.1	25.7	38.2	33.3
Supt. recommends purchase of supplies and equipment	67.1	78.7	85.2	63.3
Supt. appoints new janitors	8.6	12.1	11.7	20.7
Supt. determines new jani- tors' salaries.	0.	6.	5.8	20.7

TABLE XX (CONTINUED.)

Function	Total No. Supts. Replying			
	70 in Kan.	66 in Mo.	34 in Neh.	30 in Okla.
Supt. prescribes detailed duties of janitors	77.1	81.8	76.5	63.3
Supt. removes inefficient and insubordinate janitors.	17.1	22.7	17.6	26.7
Supt. initiates movement to place new subjects in the curriculum.	97.1	96.9	94.1	93.3
Supt. initiates movement to discard subjects from the curriculum.	97.1	95.4	91.2	90.
Supt. determines the observance of holidays.	27.1	40.9	32.3	50.
Supt. determines length of holiday recesses.	25.7	30.3	20.6	40.
Supt. determines athletic policy of school	74.3	78.7	79.4	86.7
Supt. introduces new policies for school.	82.8	84.8	85.3	80.

The authority of the school board, acting alone, in granting permission for the use of school buildings is greatest in Missouri. (Table XXI, page 63.)

Both the superintendent and school board of education grant permission for the use of school buildings for public meetings in about one-fifth of the school systems, when the states are considered individually. (Table XXII, pages 65-66.)

TABLE XXI. PERCENTAGE OF SCHOOL BOARDS IN EACH STATE THAT EXERCISE AUTHORITY IN THE FUNCTIONS LISTED.

	% Kan.	% Mo.	% Neb.	% Okla.
Board approves general plans for new buildings.	1.4	9.1	0.	10.
Board grants permission for the use of school buildings for public meetings.	27.1	37.8	17.6	23.3
Board recommends teachers for employment.	0.	1.5	0.	6.7
Board assigns teachers	1.4	3.	0.	3.3
Board transfers teachers from one grade to another or from one building to another	2.8	6.1	2.9	6.7
Board presented the idea of a salary schedule	2.1	7.9	0.	5.5
Board constructed salary schedule	0.	2.6	0.	5.5
Board determines salary for each teacher.	40.	37.8	23.5	30.
Board appoints substitutes	1.4	13.6	2.9	3.3
Board sets pay for substitutes	41.4	39.4	44.1	30.
Board prepares the budget	7.1	13.6	2.9	10.
Board recommends purchase of supplies and equipment.	0.	0.	0.	3.3
Board appoints new janitors	67.1	75.7	67.6	60.
Board determines new janitors' salaries	82.9	78.8	79.4	60.
Board prescribes detailed duties of janitors	12.9	4.5	5.9	20.

TABLE XXI (CONTINUED)

Function.	% Kan.	% Mo.	% Neb.	% Okla.
Board removes inefficient and insubordinate janitors.	45.7	60.6	52.9	43.3
Board initiates movement to place new subjects in the curriculum.	1.4	0.	0.	3.3
Board initiates the movement to discard subjects from the curriculum.	0.	0.	0.	0.
Board determines the observance of holidays.	35.7	40.9	44.1	23.3
Board determines the length of holiday recesses.	37.1	42.4	35.3	26.7
Board determines the school's policy regarding athletics	5.7	7.5	2.9	3.3
Board introduces new policies for the school.	0.	0.	0.	6.7

B. Teachers.

The authority of the/superintendent is decidedly outstanding in the recommendation of teachers for employment (Table XIX). In Nebraska 100% of the superintendents report that they have this power (Table XX).

Very seldom does the board of education act alone in the recommendation of teachers for employment. See Tables XIX and XXI.

In Kansas both the superintendent and the board

TABLE XXII. PERCENTAGE OF BOTH SUPERINTENDENTS AND SCHOOL BOARDS THAT EXERCISE AUTHORITY IN THE FUNCTIONS LISTED.

Function	% Kan.	% Mo.	% Neb.	% Okla.
Both supt. and board approve general plans for new buildings.	84.3	74.2	52.9	73.3
Both supt. and board grant permission for the use of school buildings for public meeting.	20.	16.7	23.2	20.
Both Supt. and board recommend teachers for employment.	12.9	7.6	0.	6.7
Both supt. and board assign teachers.	2.9	4.5	2.9	0.
Both supt. and board transfer teachers from one grade to another or from one building to another.	7.1	6.1	2.9	3.3
Both supt. and board presented the idea of a salary schedule.	8.3	0.	0.	0.
Both supt. and board constructed the salary schedule.	56.2	50.	38.1	27.7
Both supt. and board determine the salary for each teacher.	31.4	18.2	44.1	33.3
Both supt. and board appoint substitutes	0.	3.	2.9	0.
Both supt. and board set pay for substitutes.	7.1	6.1	8.8	16.7
Both supt. and board prepare budget.	64.3	56.1	58.8	53.3

TABLE XXII (CONTINUED.)

Function	Kan.	Mo.	Neb.	Okla.
Both supt. and board recommend purchase of supplies and equipment.	30.	21.2	14.7	33.3
Both supt. and board appoint new janitors.	21.4	10.6	20.6	16.7
Both supt. and board determine new janitors' salaries.	10.	9.1	11.6	16.7
Both supt. and board prescribe detailed duties of janitors.	7.1	7.6	12.6	13.3
Both supt. and board remove inefficient and in-subordinate janitors.	21.4	12.2	17.6	23.3
Both supt. and board initiate movement to place new subjects in the curriculum.	0.	0.	5.8	3.3
Both supt. and board initiate movement to discard subjects from the curriculum	2.9	1.5	5.8	0.
Both supt. and board determine the observance of holidays.	34.3	16.7	23.2	23.3
Both supt. and board determine the length of holiday recesses.	35.7	24.2	35.3	33.3
Both supt. and board determine the school's policy regarding athletics.	14.3	10.6	17.6	10.
Both supt. and board introduce new policies for the school.	11.4	12.2	14.7	10.

recommend teachers for employment in 12.9% of the school systems. (Table XXII, page 65).

In the assignment of teachers the superintendent is seldom hampered. Likewise, though in a slighter degree, he has decided control over the transfer of teachers. See Tables XIX and XX.

Of the 200 school systems, 125 or 62.5% have salary schedules for the payment of teachers. In over three-fourths of these school systems the idea has been presented by the superintendent of schools. In nearly one-half of the 125 school systems the superintendent has constructed the salary schedule. (Tables XIX and XX).

In only two school systems has the board of education devised a salary schedule without the aid of the superintendent. (Table XIX).

In regard to the determination of salary for each teacher, authority is rather evenly divided among the three possible agents, the superintendent, the board, and both the superintendent and the board. (Table XIX).

In most instances the superintendent controls the appointment of substitute teachers. His power in this phase of school administration exceeds 90% in all the states except Missouri. (Table XIX).

The superintendent's authority over the pay received by substitutes is not so great as that over their appointment.

The answers seem to indicate that in most instances the board supports the superintendent's recommendation that teachers be dismissed. (Table XXIII)

C. The Budget.

In over one-fourth of the school systems that reported the superintendent alone prepares the budget. The further extension of his influence in the making of the budget is shown by the fact that in over one-half of the school systems the superintendent helps the board of education prepare the budget. (Table XXII).

In the states, considered individually, the superintendent alone prepares the budget in one-third or more of the school systems in Nebraska and in Oklahoma. (Table XIX).

D. Purchase of Supplies and Equipment

The superintendent alone recommends the purchase of supplies and equipment in a majority of school systems, although both superintendent and school board work together in this matter in 50 school systems.

In none of the school systems of Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska, does the board alone recommend the purchase of supplies and equipment. (Table XXI).

E. Janitors.

The authority of the board is most marked in its

control over the appointment, pay, and removal of janitors. In 138 school systems the board alone appoints new janitors; in 155 school systems the board alone decides on their pay; and in 103 school systems the board alone removes janitors. (Table XIX).

Superintendents in Oklahoma have more authority in matters pertaining to janitors than do superintendents of the other three states. (Table XX).

In spite of the fact that boards of education largely control the pay, appointment, and dismissal of janitors, school superintendents prescribe janitorial duties in over three-fourths of the school systems. See Tables XIX and XX.

F. Curriculum.

The authority of the superintendent of schools over the curriculum is more complete than his control over any other school function. He initiates the movement to introduce new subjects into the curriculum and to discard subjects from the curriculum in nearly all cases. See Tables XIX and XX.

In Missouri and Nebraska the board initiates no movement to introduce new subjects. In none of the four states does the board initiate movements to discard subjects from the curriculum. (Table XXI, page 63.)

G. Holidays

As to who determines the observance of holidays, control is divided among the three agents who exercise administrative functions, with the board most powerful. (Table XIX).

The board alone, more than any other one agent, determines the length of holiday recesses, although the influence of the superintendent, alone and with the board, is not negligible.

H. School Athletics.

In over three-fourths of the school systems that reported, the superintendent has the only voice in regard to the school's athletic policy. In about one-seventh of the school systems both superintendent and board determine the school's policy regarding athletics. (Table XIX, page 58.)

I. New Policies.

In most school systems the superintendent of schools is responsible for the introduction of new policies regarding school administration. (Table XIX). His influence in this matter is about the same in all states. (Table IX).

Only in Oklahoma, and there to a very minor extent, does the board of education alone introduce new policies. (Table XXI).

In 24 school systems both superintendent and school board introduce new policies for the school.

J. Attitude of the Board toward Miscellaneous Matters.

TABLE XXIII. TABULATION OF THE TOTAL NUMBER OF ANSWERS
TO QUESTIONS 9, 14, 19, 34, 35, 36, ON
THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Question	Yes.	No.	Answer Qualified.
Does the board indorse the supt.'s recommendation regarding the discharge of teachers?	167	3	12
Has the board ever refused to indorse the supt.'s recommendation that a pupil be expelled?	3	184	0
Does the board ever hear recommendations with reference to school practices directly from teachers?	21	137	10
Does the board ever hear recommendations with ref- erence to school prac- tices directly from prin- cipals?	40	111	11
Does the board ever hear recommendations with reference to school practices directly from patrons?	52	98	18
Does the board ever hear grievances regarding school practices di- rectly from teachers?	22	28	13
Does the board ever hear grievances regarding school practices di- rectly from principals?	28	116	12
Does the board ever hear grievances regarding school practices di- rectly from patrons?	55	75	39

In only three school systems has the board of education refused to indorse the superintendent's recommendation that a pupil be expelled or suspended. In many instances, however, the superintendent has not asked the board to indorse his action in regard to expulsion or suspension during the present administration. (Table XXIII)

The school board hears recommendations regarding school practices from principals more often than from teachers. Such recommendations are heard directly by the board of education less frequently in Nebraska and in Oklahoma than in Missouri and in Kansas.

In ten or more instances superintendents qualified their answers by such statements as, "Not that I know of," "Not often," or "Frequently, but not always."

As to whether or not the school board hears recommendations regarding school practices from patrons, 168 school systems were heard from. Of these 168 systems, 52 reported that the board hears recommendations directly from patrons.

The answers from 18 superintendents were qualified so as to imply that their school boards or members of the board sometimes heard such recommendations directly and officially.

In over half of the school systems that reported on this matter from Kansas and Missouri, school boards hear recommendations regarding school practices directly from

patrons.

School boards hear grievances regarding school practices more often from principals than from teachers, according to the report of superintendents from Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, and Oklahoma. In the case of neither principals nor teachers was the hearing of grievances frequent.

Some answers of superintendents were conditioned by statements similar to those regarding the hearing of recommendations from principals and teachers.

In answer to the question, "Does the board ever hear grievances regarding school practices directly from patron?" there were 169 answers. In 44% of the school systems superintendents stated that their boards do not hear such grievances directly; in 33% of the school systems boards hear grievances directly; and in 23% of the school systems superintendents made conditional answers to the effect that some members of the board consider grievances directly from patrons, that the board sometimes considers grievances directly or that if the board considers grievances directly, the superintendent is not aware of it.

In the individual states the percent of superintendents who reported that the board hears grievances directly and the percent of superintendents who gave conditional answers are as follows;

in Kansas 21.6% of the superintendents reported that the school board hears grievances directly from patrons;

in Kansas 31.6% of the superintendents gave conditional answers;

in Nebraska 26.6% of the superintendents reported that the school board hears grievances directly from patrons;

in Nebraska 26.6% gave conditional answers;

in Missouri 35.8% of the superintendents reported that the board hears grievances directly from patrons;

in Missouri 13.2% of the superintendents gave conditional answers;

in Oklahoma 57.7% of the superintendents reported that the school board hears grievances directly from patrons;

in Oklahoma 19.2% of the superintendents gave conditional answers.

Summary

The approval of plans for construction of school buildings by both superintendent and school board is the most common procedure in the four states of Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, and Oklahoma.

The authority of the superintendent in the recommendation of teachers for employment is marked.

In the assignment and transfer of teachers the superintendent is seldom hampered.

In over 75% of the school systems which have a salary schedule the superintendent of schools presented the idea. In over 50% of the school systems he has constructed the salary schedule for the payment of teachers.

In regard to the determination of salary for each teacher, authority is rather evenly divided among the superintendent, the board of education, and the superintendent and the board of education, jointly.

In over 25% of the school systems the superintendent alone prepares the budget, and in over 50% of the school systems the superintendent aids the board in the preparation of the budget.

The superintendent alone recommends the purchase of supplies and equipment in a majority of school systems.

The authority of the board of education is most marked in its control over the appointment, pay, and removal of janitors. Superintendents frequently prescribe janitorial duties.

The power of the superintendent is more complete over the curriculum than over any other of the school functions that are a part of this investigation.

The observance of holidays is determined by all three agents of authority, about equally divided. The board of education, more than any one else, determines the length

of a holiday period.

In over 75% of the school systems the superintendent determines the school's policy regarding athletics.

The superintendent usually introduces new school policies.

The school board more often hears recommendations and grievances regarding school practices from principals than from teachers.

In about one-third of the school systems the board hears recommendations and grievances directly from patrons. In a number of other cases the superintendent qualified his answer to imply the board sometimes hears grievances regarding school practices.

Chapter VII.

CORRELATION OF RESULTS.

Twenty-four items of authority were selected for consideration in connection with the superintendent's training, experience, tenure, and size of city. See items 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, and 34, on the questionnaire, page 91.

Coefficients of correlation and P. E.'s were computed. See Rugg's "Statistical Methods Applied to Education", page 256.

TABLE XXIV. CORRELATION BETWEEN TRAINING AND AUTHORITY
IN THE FOUR STATES, 200 SUPERINTENDENTS
REPLYING.

Number of Items on Which Supt. Has Author- ity.	Superintendents' Training					Total
	No De- gree.	Bache- lor's Degree	1-15 Hrs. Grad- uate Work	16-29 Hrs. Grad- uate Work	30 or More Hrs. Graduate Work, With or Without Mas- ter's Degree	
25-24					1	1
21-22		1	2	2	3	8
19-20	1	1	3	2	8	15
17-18		2	7	3	11	23
15-16	2	1	12	12	18	45
13-14	2	7	11	9	12	41
11-12	1	3	15	10	9	38
9-10	2	4	5	4	5	20
7-8		1	1	3	1	6
5-6		1			1	2
3-4				1		1
1-2						0
Total	8	21	56	46	69	200

The r between the training of superintendents
and the amount of authority they possess is .168_±.045.
Such a degree of correlation is too small to be significant.

1. Rugg, H. O., Statistical Methods Applied to Education,
p. 256.

TABLE XXV. RELATIONSHIP OF AUTHORITY TO TOTAL EXPERIENCE OF SUPERINTENDENTS IN THE FOUR STATES, 200 SUPERINTENDENTS REPLYING.

Number of Items on Which Supt. Has Author- ity	Years of Total Experience of Superintendents								Total
	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	31-35	36 & More	
23-24					1				1
21-22	1	2	3	2					8
19-20		3	4	4	1	2	1		15
17-18	1	5	6	7	2	2			23
15-16		14	11	7	4	4	4	1	45
13-14	3	11	10	12	1	3	1		41
11-12	5	8	12	7	3	1	2		38
9-10		3	6	4	2	3	1	1	20
7-8	1	2	2		1				6
5-6			1			1			2
3-4					1				1
1-2									0
Total	11	48	55	43	16	16	9	2	200

The r between years' total experience and amount of authority the superintendent possesses is $-.08 \pm .047$. Such a degree of correlation is too small to be significant.

TABLE XXVI. CORRELATION BETWEEN AMOUNT OF AUTHORITY
AND TENURE IN THE FOUR STATES, 200
SUPERINTENDENTS REPLYING.

Number of Items on Which Supt. Has Author- ity	Number of Years in Present Position								
	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	9-10	11-12	13-14	15 & More	Total
25-24	1								1
21-22	3	2			2		1		6
19-20	3	5	4	2	1				15
17-18	9	8	2	1		1		2	23
15-16	15	14	6	6	2			2	45
13-14	18	12	5	5				1	41
11-12	19	13	2	2		1		1	38
9-10	7	5	3	3		1		1	20
7-8	4			1			1		6
5-6	1						1		2
3-4			1						1
1-2									0
Total	80	59	23	20	5	3	3	7	200

The r between tenure of present position and the amount of authority the superintendent has is $.043 \pm .047$. Such a degree of correlation is too low to be significant.

TABLE XXVII. CORRELATION BETWEEN SIZE OF CITY AND
AMOUNT OF AUTHORITY IN THE FOUR STATES,
200 SUPERINTENDENTS REPLYING.

Number of Items on Which Supt. Has Author- ity.	Population of City					Total
	1,000- 1,999.	2,000- 3,999.	4,000- 6,999.	7,000- 9,999.	10,000- 15,000.	
23-24					1	1
21-22	3	3	2			8
19-20	4	5	3	2	1	15
17-18	5	8	4	3	3	23
15-16	11	20	12	2		45
13-14	13	20	3	3	2	41
11-12	15	13	5	4	1	38
9-10	13	5			2	20
7-8	3	1	2			6
5-6		2				2
3-4	1					1
1-2						0
Total	68	77	31	14	10	200

The r between size of city in which the superintendent is employed and the extent of his authority is $.194 \pm .045$, a degree of correlation too small to be significant. The P. E. is $.045$, which is not too large to make the r reliable.

TABLE XXVIII. CORRELATION BETWEEN SIZE OF CITY AND TRAINING OF SUPERINTENDENTS IN THE FOUR STATES, 200 SUPERINTENDENTS REPLYING.

SIZE OF CITY	TRAINING OF SUPERINTENDENTS					Total
	No De- Gree.	Bache- lor's Degree.	1-15 Hrs. Grad- uate Work.	16-29 Hrs. Grad- uate Work.	30 or More Hrs. Graduate Work, With or Without Mas- ter's Degree.	
10,000- 15,000	1		1	3	5	10
7,000- 9,999			4	3	7	14
4,000- 6,999	1	3	3	12	12	31
2,000- 3,999	1	11	24	11	30	77
1,000- 1,999	5	7	24	17	15	68
Total	8	21	56	46	69	200

An r between size of city and amount of training was made to determine whether or not larger cities employ superintendents with higher training. The r is $.206 \pm .045$. This r is higher than either the r between training and authority or the r between size of city and authority.

The r of $.206$ is not very large, but it shows a tendency for better trained superintendents to secure positions in the larger cities of this investigation.

There are also factors other than training that tend to place certain superintendents in larger cities.

Summary

This investigation shows the following correlations to exist;

- (a) between training and authority $r = .168 \pm .045$;
- (b) between total years' experience and authority
 $r = -.08 \pm .047$;
- (c) between tenure and amount of authority $r =$
 $.043 \pm .047$;
- (d) between size of city and amount of authority
 $r = .194 \pm .045$;
- (e) between size of city and amount of training
 $r = .206 \pm .045$.

Chapter VIII.

CONCLUSION

In the school systems investigated in Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, and Oklahoma, the training of the superintendents is about the same as that of the average superintendent over the United States. In this study the average superintendent has 20.5 hours' graduate study. In the next decade or two in the larger cities of this investigation the minimum requirement will probably be raised to the Master's degree or to a superintendent's certificate which will be the equivalent of 30 semester hours or more graduate work.

If the superintendent is to have more professional freedom, some method of securing it, other than extending the amount of training, must be sought. If knowledge of proper conduct of a school system is the important thing in selecting the superintendent, then some means should be devised by which the superintendent will be left free to conduct the school system according to the best educational practices. Legislation granting the superintendent such authority might be one solution. Education of the mass of people to recognize that the superintendency requires an expert trained official just the same as other businesses and professions demand it is a second solution.

If personal traits are among the essential

qualities, by which the superintendent obtains authority, then these characteristics should be isolated, and persons having these qualities should be selected and trained for the superintendency.

The average city school superintendent in Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, and Oklahoma, has a median total experience of 14.1 years. He has usually served as high school principal, an experience which should fit him to understand the problems of secondary school administration.

Tenure of position is unstable. About one-fifth of the superintendents of this investigation changed positions last year. In some individual states there was even a greater turn over. The median length of tenure is about 3.7 years.

The attractiveness of the profession of the school superintendent would be materially enhanced if the length of term which the superintendent spends in the community could be lengthened. It is recognized that it is impossible to fix in advance the exact number of years which would be best to make the fixed term of the superintendent . . . It is unquestionably true, however, that a longer term of office in any city where the superintendent is a real educational leader would increase the effectiveness of the schools.¹

Some educators advocate that:

That the original period of employment be three years, and that if the services of the superintendent are satisfactory to the board of education so that he is continued in office it be understood that the additional term of the superintendent shall be three to five years.¹

1. First Yearbook of the Department of Superintendence, 1923, Chap. VII, pp.110-111, p. 122.

As cities in Missouri, Kansas, Nebraska, and Oklahoma are larger in size, they tend to employ superintendents that are better trained and to retain such superintendents for a longer period of tenure.

The superintendent's professional freedom has increased gradually since the establishment of the office. In the states of this investigation the superintendent has his greatest professional freedom in the appointment of teachers, the introduction of new school policies, the purchase of supplies and equipment, the placing of new subjects in the curriculum, and the discarding of old subjects from the curriculum.

The superintendent has least control over length of holiday periods and janitors.

The school board is more likely to consider grievances and recommendations from principals than from teachers. Both recommendations and grievances are heard directly from patrons in a number of school systems.

Slight positive correlations were found to exist between training and authority and size of city and authority. The correlations which exist between experience and authority and tenure and authority are negligible.

Since the above correlations exist, it is evident that factors other than amount of training, experience, tenure, and size of city, exert considerable influence on the amount of authority delegated to the superintendent.

APPENDIX:

A. Bibliography

B. Questionnaire

C. List of Cities in the Study

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Ballou, F. W., The Appointment of Teachers in Cities, Harvard University Press, 1915.
2. Barnard, Henry, Old Hartford School (Passage was re-quoted from Morrison' The Legal Status of the City Superintendent.)
3. Beveridge, J. H., The Hazards of the Superintendency: Proceedings of N. E. A., Vol. 62, 1924.
4. Broome, E. C., Strengthening the Superintendency: Proceedings of N. E. A., Vol. 58, 1920.
5. Catalogs of the Universities of Kansas, Missouri, Oklahoma, and Nebraska, also of Teachers' College, Columbia University.
6. Chadsey, C. E., Report of the Committee on the Status of the Superintendent: Proceedings of N. E. A., Vol. 59, 1921.
7. Chadsey, C. E. Report of the Committee on the Status of the Superintendent: Proceedings of N. E. A., Vol. 61, 1923.
8. Chancellor, W. E., Our City Schools, D.C. Heath & Co., 1908.
9. Cubberley, E. P., Portland Survey, World Book Co., 1915.
10. Cubberley, E. P., Public School Administration, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1916.
11. Cubberley, E. P., Report of the Survey of the School System, Salt Lake City, 1915, Grocer Publishing Co.
12. Cubberley, E. P., Superintendent of Schools, El. School J., Nov., 1915, Vol. 15.
13. Deffenbaugh, W. S., The Superintendent: Administration in Smaller Cities, Bureau of Ed. Bul. 2, 1922.
14. Deffenbaugh, W. S. Administration of Village Schools, Bureau of Ed. Bul. 86, 1920.
15. Doeden, F., Legal Status of the City Superintendent; Sch., & Soc., April 7, 1917, Vol. 5.

BIBLIOGRAPHY (Continued.)

16. Engelhardt, W. L., Suggestions on the Report of the Committee on the Status of the Superintendent: Proceedings of N. E. A., Vol. 61, 1923.
17. Evenden, E. S., Teachers' Salaries and Salary Schedules in the United States: Proceedings of N. E. A., Vol. 58, 1920.
18. First Yearbook of the Department of Superintendence, 1923.
19. Function Analysis of School Administration, Educational Review, Dec., 1924.
20. Geiger, W. F., What Shall Be Done to Keep High Class Superintendents in the School Systems: Proceedings of N. E. A., 1920.
21. Higher Education Circular 30, 1925.
22. Judd, C. H., Protection of Professional Interests: Proceedings of N. E. A., Vol. 53, 1915.
23. Kansas Educational Directory, 1925-26.
24. Koos, L. V., The High School Principal, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1924.
25. Linn, L. P., Organization Powers Accorded City School Superintendents by General Laws: Sch. & Soc., Vol. 7, May 25, 1918.
26. Linn, L. P., The City School Superintendent in General Legislation: Sch. & Soc., Vol. 8, Nov. 30, 1918.
27. Missouri Educational Directory, 1925-26.
28. Morrison, J. C., The Legal Status of the City School Superintendent, Warwick and York, 1922.
29. Nebraska Educational Directory, 1925-26.
30. Oklahoma Educational Directory, 1925-26.
31. Otis, A. S., Statistical Methods in Educational Measurements, World Book Co., 1925.
32. Relation of Boards of Education to Superintendents: El. School J., Vol. 17, Feb. 1917.

BIBLIOGRAPHY, (Continued.)

33. Report of Chicago Educational Commission, 1899.
34. Rugg, H. O., Statistical Methods Applied to Education, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1917.
35. Sears, J. B., The School Survey, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1925.
36. Smith, H. P., Business Administration of a City School System, Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1925.
37. Smith, Payson, What Progress Has Superintendence Made? Proceedings of the N. E. A., Vol. 63, 1925.
38. Spaulding, F. E., Superintendency as a Career: Sch. & Soc., Jan. 14, 1922.
39. Stone, C.W., & Randall, C. E., The Superintendent and His Board: American School Board Journal, Oct., 1925.
40. Strayer, G. D., Relation of Administrative Officers to Boards of Education: Proceedings of N. E. A., Vol. 60, 1922.
41. Strayer, G.D., Some Problems of City School Administration, World Book Co., 1916.
42. Studebaker, J. W., School Board Organization and the Superintendent: Proceedings of the N. E. A., Vol. 62, 1924.
43. Theisen, W. W., The City Superintendent and Board of Education, Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University.
44. United States Census, 1920.
45. Van Sickle, J. H., Best Use of Superintendent's Time: Proceedings of the N. E. A., Vol. 59, 192.

1. City _____ State _____

2. Degrees held? A. B., B. S., M. A., M. S., B. Ped., No degree, _____
(Draw a circle around the degree or degrees you hold.)

3. Draw a circle around the number in front of any of the following courses which you have studied:

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. Educational psychology | 12. Buildings (Problems of administration) |
| 2. School surveys | 13. Finance (Problems of administration) |
| 3. School hygiene and health | 14. Curriculum construction (Elementary or high school curriculum) |
| 4. Educational statistics | 15. _____ |
| 5. Comparative education | 16. _____ |
| 6. School law | 17. _____ |
| 7. Supervision of instruction | 18. _____ |
| 8. Course in vocational education | 19. _____ |
| 9. Research in education | 20. _____ |
| 10. Secondary school administration | |
| 11. City school administration (Educational administration) | |

(Insert in the blank lines any other professional courses which have prepared you to be a superintendent.)

4. How many weeks of graduate study have you had? ____; indicate credit received by one of the following terms: Sem. hrs. ____; Term hrs. ____; Points ____; Majors ____.

5. How many years have you been engaged in the teaching profession; (include all teaching and administrative experience) ____ yrs? In all answers include the present year.

6. How many years have you done teaching in conjunction with your administrative duties as elementary prin. ____ yrs.; as high school prin. ____; as supt. ____ yrs?

7. How many years have your administrative duties consumed your entire time as ele. prin. ____ yrs; as high school prin. ____ yrs; as Supt. ____.

8. Number of years in present position; include present year. ____ yrs.

Answer the following questions with reference to your present position.

9. Have any new buildings been planned or constructed during the present administration? Please check the correct answer Yes. No.

10. Who approves general plans for new buildings? . . . Supt. Board. Both.

11. Who grants permission for the use of school buildings for public meetings? Supt. Board.

12. Who recommends teachers for employment? Supt. Board.

13. Who assigns teachers? Supt. Board.

2.

14. Has the board a salary schedule for the payment of teachers? Yes. No.
15. If so, who presented the salary schedule idea? Supt. Board.
16. Who constructed the salary schedule? Supt. Board. Both.
17. Who transfers teachers from one grade to another or from one building to another? Supt. Board.
18. Who determines the salary for each teacher? Supt. Board.
19. Does the board indorse the superintendent's recommendation regarding the discharge of teachers? Yes. No.
20. Who appoints substitutes? Supt. Board.
21. Who sets pay for substitutes? Supt. Board.
22. Who prepares the budget? Supt. Board. Both.
23. Who recommends the purchase of supplies and equipment? Supt. Board. Both.
24. Who appoints new janitors? Supt. Board.
25. Who determines new janitors' salaries? Supt. Board.
26. Who prescribes detailed duties of janitors? Supt. Board.
27. Who removes inefficient and insubordinate janitors? Supt. Board.
28. Who initiates the movement to place new subjects in the curriculum? Supt. Board.
29. Who initiates the movement to discard subjects from the curriculum? Supt. Board.
30. Who determines the observance of holidays? Supt. Board.
31. Who determines the length of holiday recesses? Supt. Board.
32. Who determines the school's policy regarding Athletics? Supt. Board.
33. Who introduces new policies for the school? Supt. Board.
34. Has the board ever refused to indorse the supt.'s recommendation that a pupil be expelled? Yes. No.
35. Does the board ever hear recommendation with reference to school practice directly from teachers_____; principals_____; patrons_____?
36. Does the board ever hear grievances regarding school practices directly from teachers_____; principals_____; patrons_____?

If you desire to comment or give a more detailed statement to any of the questions in the questionnaire, you may use the back of the sheets.

Number your answer the same as the question on this questionnaire.

**LIST OF CITIES AND NAMES OF SUPERINTENDENTS CONTRIBUTING
TO THIS STUDY.**

CITY	STATE	SUPERINTENDENT
Afton	Oklahoma	H. L. Camp
Anadarko	"	A. C. Streeter
Atoka	"	G. T. Stubbs
Carmen	"	David Pierce
Chandler	"	C. L. Williams
Chelsea	"	Clay DeFord
Claremore	"	H. Clay Fisk
Cleveland	"	Chester P. Davis
Cushing	"	John W. Whipple
Dewey	"	E. L. Hurlock
Durant	"	R. R. Tompkins
El Reno	"	John T. Butcher
Forgan #	"	C. R. Ballard
Guthrie	"	H. L. Allen
Hominy	"	Albert W. Bevers
Kaw City #	"	Page Manley
Kiefer	"	A. C. Elliott
Kingfisher	"	F. J. Reynolds
Medford	"	J. W. McCollom
Miami	"	J. E. Arendell
Newkirk	"	W. A. Erdman
Norman	"	Elmer Capshaw
Nowata	"	R. Lee Snyder
Okemah	"	James A. Estill
Pawhuska	"	J. O. Hall
Perry	"	W. Max Chambers
Ponca City	"	J. N. Hamilton
Pryor	"	J. C. Williams
Stroud	"	Ross Kendall
Wagner	"	James O. Crook
<hr/>		
Alliance	Nebraska	H. R. Partridge
Auburn	"	R. H. Graham
Aurora	"	J. A. Doremus
Beatrice	"	W. H. Norton
Central City	"	E. L. Novotny
College View	"	Milton E. Transchel
Columbus	"	R. R. McGee
Crete	"	C. H. Velte
David City	"	O. L. Webb
Falls City	"	A. C. Gwinn
Friend	"	C. W. Lehman
Fullerton	"	J. R. Bitner
Geneva	"	R. W. Kretsinger

Cities were less than 1,000 according to 1920 census.

LIST OF CITIES AND NAMES OF SUPERINTENDENTS CONTRIBUTING
TO THIS STUDY.

CITY	STATE	SUPERINTENDENT
Gothenburg	Nebraska	Harry A. Burke
Grand Island	"	C. Ray Gates
Havelock	"	Harry E. Tyler
Hebora	"	H. J. Freeborn
Lexington	"	C. E. Collett
Pawnee	"	F. C. Thomann
Plattsmouth	"	George E. Dewolf
Schuyler	"	R. T. Fosnot
Scottsbluff	"	E. L. Rouse
Seward	"	M. C. Bloss
South Sioux City	"	E. N. Swett
Superior	"	J. A. Christenson
Sutton	"	Arthur H. Platt
Tecumseh	"	Lloyd D. Halsted
Tekamah	"	Harry H. Reimund
University Place	"	O. H. Bimson
Wayne	"	Theo. Stephen Hook
West Point	"	H. H. Linn
Wisner	"	Raymond H. White
Wymore	"	E. M. Short
York	"	Conrad Jacobson

Altoona	Kansas	Paul Hancock
Anthony	"	Everett D. Gunn
Arkansas City	"	C. E. St. John
Arma	"	W. L. Rambo
Ashland	"	F. E. Niles
Augusta	"	G. H. Marshall
Baxter Springs	"	G. R. White
Belleville	"	W. O. Stark
Beloit	"	C. O. Smith
Blue Rapids	"	G. A. Swift
Bonner Springs	"	J. A. Fleming
Burlingame	"	E. L. Heilman
Burlington	"	E. J. Chesky
Caldwell	"	J. H. Pendleton
Caney	"	J. R. Popkins
Chanute	"	L. H. Petit
Cherryvale	"	John P. Sheffield
Chetopa	"	G. L. Widner
Concordia	"	W. E. Sheffer
Dodge City	"	O. F. Hite
Downs	"	A. D. Haas
Ellis	"	D. F. Klemm
Ellsworth	"	O. J. Silverwood
Fort Scott	"	V. M. Liston
Galena	"	Glenn L. Wycoff
Garden City	"	C. I. Vinsonhaler
Garnett	"	C. H. Oman
Girard	"	T. E. Osborn

LIST OF CITIES AND NAMES OF SUPERINTENDENTS CONTRIBUTING
TO THIS STUDY.

CITY	STATE	SUPERINTENDENT
Harper	Kansas	P. N. Heck
Hays	"	C. A. Shively
Hiawatha	"	Wade C. Fowler
Hillsboro	"	J. H. Franzen
Hoisington	"	Edward D. Kroesch
Holton	"	Neal M. Wherry
Iola	"	A. M. Thoroman
Junction City	"	J. H. Clement
Kingman	"	Guy H. Jaggard
Kinsley	"	C. M. Rankin
Kiowa	"	Geo. C. Stevens
La Harpe	"	J. H. Culbertson
Larned	"	R. V. Phinney
Liberal	"	N. B. Mahuron
Lincoln	"	L. J. Stark
Lindsborg	"	Elmer Ahlstedt
Lyons	"	C. A. Yeomans
McPherson	"	R. W. Potwin
Manhattan	"	E. B. Gift
Medicine Lodge	"	I. V. Martin
Minneapolis	"	Geo. E. Bear
Mulberry	"	Mae L. Gale
Newton	"	John B. Heffelfinger
Osawatimie	"	George A. York
Oswego	"	C. T. Johnson
Paola	"	A. M. McCullough
Peabody	"	Ira O. Scott
Phillipsburg	"	Roy V. Green
Pratt	"	W. A. Wood
Protection	"	J. F. Hoch
Russell	"	O. G. Rouse
St. John	"	C. C. Trillingham
Sabetha	"	F. C. Marks
Scammon	"	Paul E. Johnston
Sedan	"	E. E. Stonecipher
Seneca	"	A. J. Venning
Smith Center	"	G. R. Oleson
Stockton	"	C. A. Templer
Valley Falls	"	Fred L. Miller
Washington	"	C. Kraemer
Wellington	"	A. D. Zook
Yates Center	"	W. T. Markham
<hr/>		
Aurora	Missouri	Howard Kelley
Bevier	"	Claude N. Dye
Bolivar	"	John A. Doak
Bonne Terre	"	Fred Bruner
Brookfield	"	L. V. Crookshank
Brunswick	"	J. A. Burnside
Butler	"	F. Olin Capps

LIST OF CITIES AND NAMES OF SUPERINTENDENTS CONTRIBUTING
TO THIS STUDY.

CITY	STATE	SUPERINTENDENT
California	Missouri	John O. Henderson
Cameron	"	E. A. Elliott
Cape Girardeau	"	J. A. Whiteford
Cartersville	"	H. Nelson McCall
Carthage	"	W. C. Barnes
Centralia	"	W. S. Drace
Chillicothe	"	G. E. Dille
Clinton	"	Arthur Lee
Columbia	"	W. I. Oliver
Crystal City	"	Lloyd V. Black
Edina	"	Eugene D. Hess
Eldon	"	Paul M. Marshall
El Dorado Springs	"	S. J. Holloway
Gallatin	"	Leonard S. Hosman
Granby	"	G. B. Selvidge
Hamilton	"	Chas. Myers
Higbee	"	C. A. O'Dell
Holden	"	Walter H. Ryle
Hunsville	"	C. J. Burger
Independence	"	E. B. Street
Jefferson City	"	W. M. Oakerson
King City	"	Raymond A. Watson
Kirksville	"	J. H. Neville
Kirkwood	"	F. P. Tillman
La Grange	"	R. J. Westfall
Lamar	"	N. E. Viles
Lexington	"	L. H. Bell
Macon	"	M. S. Vaughn
Marcelline	"	E. F. Chapman
Marshall	"	W. M. Westbrook
Maryville	"	L. E. Ziegler
Maysville	"	F. A. Thompson
Memphis	"	W. E. Rosenstengel
Mexico	"	L. B. Hawthorne
Milan	"	F. J. Appleby
Monett	"	C. E. Evans
Neosho	"	Clyde H. O'Dell
Odessa	"	J. M. Davidson
Palmyra	"	Lee D. Ash
Pleasant Hill	"	C. F. Johns
Popular Bluff	"	John Cantlon
Rich Hill	"	D. U. Groce
Richmond	"	Price L. Collier
Rock Port	"	H. W. Leech
Rolla	"	B. P. Lewis
St. Charles	"	W. F. Knox
Salisbury	"	Chas. C. Miles
Seneca	"	Roy Scantlin
Slater	"	Willard E. Goslin

**LIST OF CITIES AND NAMES OF SUPERINTENDENTS CONTRIBUTING
TO THIS STUDY.**

CITY	STATE	SUPERINTENDENT
Stanberry	Missouri	L. A. Velill
Tarkio	"	E. R. Adams
Unionville	"	R. H. Watson
Versailles	"	H. L. Palmer
Warrensburg	"	Edward Beatty
Washington	"	William J. Peterman
Webb City	"	Geo. E. Masters
Webster Groves	"	W. A. Gore
West Plains	"	James R. Martin
Windsor	"	L. T. Hoback

The following cities returned questionnaires too late to be included in the compilation.

City	State	Superintendent
Fremont	Nebraska	J. H. Waterhouse
Coldwater	Kansas	H. E. Crosswhite
Olathe	"	E. N. Hill
Princeton	Missouri	Stephen G. La Mar